

295;

Group III: Claims 13-17, drawn to methods or regulating DNA expression, classified in class 435, subclass 471; and

Group IV: Claims 19-20, drawn to methods of nucleic acid detection, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement, and provisionally elect Group I (claims 1-11 drawn to SEQ ID NO: 81) for further prosecution.

Applicants submit that the complete examination of the application would be handled most expeditiously by treating all of the pending claims as a single entity. As Section 803 of the MPEP directs, “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.” Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not shown that a search and examination of the entire application would cause a serious burden. Rather, a serious burden would arise if the application were restricted.

Applicants submit that the restriction requirement is inappropriate. For example, Applicants contend that, at least, Group I and Group II should be examined simultaneously because they are related as a nucleic acid molecule and a transgenic plant comprising said nucleic acid molecule. Accordingly, examination of Group I and II together would pose no undue burden to the Examiner. Furthermore, Applicants submit that restriction to a single nucleotide sequence is improper and Applicants believe no serious burden would result by the search and examination of at least ten nucleotide sequences. Applicants disagree that each nucleotide sequence in the application is necessarily a patentably distinct species, but

provisionally elect the species of Group I (nucleic acids represented by SEQ ID NO: 81) for further prosecution.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants submit that the restriction requirement is improper and therefore should be withdrawn. To facilitate prosecution, however, Applicants have provisionally elected, with traverse, Group I (claims 1-11 drawn to SEQ ID NO: 81).

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at (314) 694-6343.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Pamela J. Sisson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Pamela" being the most prominent part.

DATE: 10/1/2003

Pamela J. Sisson  
(Registration NO. 53,600)

Patent Department E2NA  
MONSANTO COMPANY  
800 N. Lindbergh Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63167  
Telephone: (314) 694-6343  
FAX: (314) 694-1671